

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1, the specification and Abstract are amended. Support for claim 1 can be found at least at paragraphs [0066] and [0069], and Fig. 2. Thus, no new matter is added.

**I. Election of Species Requirement**

In the Response to Election of Species Requirement filed on July 8, 2005, Applicants elected Species I, Figs. 1-3, 4(a), 4(b) and 11, with traverse, and asserted that claims 1-5 and 18-22 read on the elected species, claims 1-3, 5, 18-20 and 22 being generic to all species. In the Supplemental Amendment filed on August 11, 2005, Applicants amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3, and canceled claim 3 accordingly.

The Office Action erroneously asserts that in the reply filed on July 8, 2005, Applicant elected, Species I, Figs. 1-3, 4(a), 4(b) and 11, with traverse, drawn to claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18-22. Although, claim 3 was cancelled by Applicant, it should be understood that claim 3 was elected. Correction of the record is thus respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, remains generic to all Species.

**II. The Abstract Satisfies All Formal Requirements**

The Office Action objects to the Abstract for exceeding 150 words. By this Amendment, the Abstract is amended. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects to claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2001-125195 to Hitachi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,960 to Watanabe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 18-22 would not have been rendered obvious by Hitachi in view of Watanabe. None of the applied references teach or suggest a light source that includes "a

lamp housing ... having a through-window," and "the concave mirror including the permeable port which is corresponding to the through-window, ... and the protective wall being arranged apart from the light permeable member," as recited in claim 1.

As acknowledged by the Office Action, Hitachi does not disclose the claimed protective wall that is arranged in position to prevent direct collision between the mesh and the broken pieces of the lamp that have bounced by the collision with the light permeable member. Furthermore, Hitachi does not disclose "the protective wall being arranged apart from the light permeable member," as recited in claim 1. Instead, the protective wall 2 of Hitachi is in contact with the light permeable member 6 as shown in Figs. 3 and 6. Thus, because direct collision between the mesh and the broken pieces of the lamp that have bounced by the collision with the light permeable member does occur, Hitachi does not disclose the claimed protective wall.

Further, Watanabe does not remedy the deficiency. Watanabe is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a permeable protective structure. However, Watanabe does not disclose the protective wall that is arranged in a position to prevent direct collision between the mesh and broken pieces of lamp, as recited in claim 1.

Watanabe discloses scattering-preventing pieces 199, 200, 201 formed in the cover member 202. See, e.g., Watanabe, col. 8, lines 41-60, and Figs. 7 and 8. The cover member 202 of Watanabe is a part of the lamp housing 184. See, e.g., Watanabe, col. 8, lines 4-40, and Fig. 7. However, the cover member 202 of Watanabe does not protect the mesh covering the permeable port included in the concave mirror. Thus, Watanabe does not disclose a protective structure that protects the mesh, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Watanabe does not disclose "a permeable port, which is corresponding to the through-window," as recited in claim 1. Nowhere does Watanabe disclose this feature.

Thus, even if there is motivation to combine Hitachi with Watanabe, the combination of the lamp of Hitachi with the structure of Watanabe, would not result in the claimed light source.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Hitachi and Watanabe. Further, claims 2, 4, 5 and 18-22, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Hitachi and Watanabe for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/djb

Attachment:  
Amended Abstract

Date: November 22, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---